

From: [OMEALY Mikell](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Cc: [ANDERSON Jim M](#)
Subject: Monday's meeting summary; need for clarification on facilitator's role
Date: 04/06/2006 09:54 AM
Attachments: [4.3.06.Eco-HH RA Scale Meeting Summary.doc](#)

Eric, Chip, Joe and Dana,

Val, Aron and Patti have raised questions about what my role is and what I will do as facilitator in our meetings. If EPA would like me to continue to serve as a facilitator, it might be helpful for you to outline the role you'd like me to play and the tasks you'd like me to do as facilitator, to clarify how you'd like meetings and follow-up actions to occur (this could include agenda preparation before meetings, how agreements/disagreements are captured during meetings, participant responsibilities, product review by the team after meetings, and finalizing products). As the lead agency, all of this is EPA's call. We can talk about it more at our 1pm meeting today.

Attached is my recommended final summary of Monday's meeting, incorporating the clarifying edits I received from team members. Most team members expressed that they felt my notes were an accurate, helpful summary of what we agreed to in the meeting, to help us move forward on issue resolution with the LWG.

Val, Aron and Patti suggested that my summary be only a list of bullets recorded directly from the notes I took on flip charts, without any context information to provide a fuller picture of the meeting. At no point during Monday's meeting do I recall a suggestion from any team member that my meeting summary be only "bullets" of information from the flip chart notes (leaving out context info), and if someone had in fact suggested this, I probably would have objected because I don't feel that stand-alone bullets are particularly helpful. As an experienced facilitator, I usually provide complete meeting products that summarize the progress we made in the meeting and outline next steps, setting us up to address issues raised and move forward. My meeting products could take many different forms (e.g., summary of agreements/disagreements, proposals for addressing issues, technical or policy recommendations, etc.) depending on the purpose and outcome of the meeting. I use flip charts to capture areas of agreement/disagreement during the meeting (rather than projecting typed notes on a screen) so that the team's valuable meeting time is not wasted on wordsmithing, and I ask the team to review a written summary after the meeting to provide any refining or clarifying edits needed. In my experience working with the TCT and its subgroups, as well as various other groups I've facilitated, this process works well. That said, sometimes I do use projected typed notes during meetings when our purpose in the meeting is to wordsmith technical recommendations. Bottom line -- it's important to use the right tool for the task at hand.

Thus, I have not removed contextual information in the attached summary as Val, Aron and Patty suggested. EPA (as the lead) may of course choose to remove this or other information in the summary if you'd like. Again, I think it would be helpful for EPA to clarify the role you'd like me to play and tasks you'd like me to do if you want me to continue as facilitator, so these types of misunderstandings don't hold us up in the future.

If you have any questions about the meeting summary or my thoughts above, please let me know.

Thanks,
Mikell

-----Original Message-----

From: Valerie Lee [mailto:valerie.lee@eiltd.net]

Sent: Wednesday, April 05, 2006 2:26 PM

To: Rose Longoria

Cc: OMEALY Mikell; Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; audiehuber@ctuir.com; ANDERSON Jim M;

cunninghame@gorge.net; exec@eiltld.net; howp@critfc.org; jean.lee@eiltld.net; jeremy_buck@fws.gov; Smith.Judy@epamail.epa.gov; Kawabata.Sylvia@epamail.epa.gov; KEPLER Rick J; tomd@ctsi.nsn.us; Lori_Cora/R10/USEPA/US@epamail.epa.gov; Sheldrake.Sean@epamail.epa.gov; Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; joeo@nezperce.org; MCCLINCY Matt; struck.rodney@deq.state.or.us; PETERSON Jenn L; POULSEN Mike; Fuentes.Rene@epamail.epa.gov; Black.Curt@epamail.epa.gov; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; emadden@ecoisp.com; Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov; jeff.baker@grandronde.org; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov; TOEPEL Kathryn; Ron Gouguet; Chris Thompson; rgensemer@parametrix.com

Subject: Re: Summary of Monday's meeting - review by 1:00 on Wednesday

Mikell:

I have some suggested changes and a basis of a number of them are as follows. My understanding of the consensus was that you would be capturing the points of agreement, disagreements, significant issues, and action items in a series of bullets to which we all agreed in the meeting. As we discussed in the meeting, it is impossible for a facilitator to both take accurate notes and facilitate simultaneously. As a result, the "bullet approach" to which we agreed me seemed to be a good approach to achieving EPA's goals of getting at the essence of the what the shared views were for inclusion in their communication to the LWG. Bullets drafted by the group also are useful to highlight for EPA significant differences, which the some partners believed were best kept confidential. I agreed to the bulleted approach as supplanting the creation of "notes" by the facilitator. I have looked back at Aron's notes of the meeting and the notes support my recollection of the discussion and my agreement. To the extent others may have different views, it highlights the lack of consensus on the approach that is set forth in your meeting summary. If that is the case, we need to revisit the "notes" issue.

Given the foregoing, please delete the introductory information, and the paragraph related to notetaking and the read ahead material. The material is a subset of the discussion and key points are not there. Moreover, the statement of consensus on notetaking and role is somewhat off from I believe I was the consensus in the meeting. They also do not follow what I thought were the groundrules for the creation of meeting summaries, especially in view of others concerns about the discoverability of documents in DEQ and partner hands. The redline is attached. Chris will have some more specific edits on the bullets themselves. I assume that the text reflected in these bullets is the language that was on the flip charts, correct? I could not see what was on the charts!

A suggestion for improvement not related to the meeting summary is that it would be helpful to have an LCD projector. A number of us (me included) could not read what you wrote on the flip charts. Given the importance of these bullets as building a base for the EPA and the eco-technical team providing written reactions and direction to the LWG, it would be helpful to see things in real time. We listen well, but it is very difficult to provide input or approval to text that is only read but not seen. As a result, LCDs are the way to go!

Finally, apparently, in a call yesterday you said that you would be drafting a document with Chip and Eric to provide EPA's (and partner's) reactions to the Eco Risk Framework Document. It was our understanding that the Eco-team technical folks would be helping to do this, just as we did in the fall. Could you please circulate a draft of this document at least to us? The initial drafts of the direction that was sent to the LWG in the fall underwent substantial input and editing by

Jeremy and Chris and I am sure others. The end result benefitted from this technical review. After all, the best folks to craft the final draft of the reactions to the eco framework are the eco technical team members. We did not understand the role of the facilitator as including creating a final draft of this document with input Chip and Eric. Nuance is important and it helps to be as technically precise as possible. Thus, Eco Team review is extremely helpful. We look forward to seeing a draft!

I hope this helps. Thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

Valerie Lee

OMEALY Mikell wrote:

Attached is a draft summary of yesterday's meeting for your review. As I mentioned yesterday, please send me any suggested changes you have for this document by 4:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday). Because of the short timeline, please copy all members of the group on your comments so everyone has the option of seeing what you propose. If the short review timeline poses a problem for you, please let me know.

Thanks again for your great work yesterday. I look forward to seeing you all next week.
Cheers,
Mikell

-----Original Message-----

From: OMEALY Mikell
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 10:56 AM
To: 'Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov'; audiehuber@ctuir.com; ANDERSON Jim
M; cunninghame@gorge.net; exec@envintl.com; howp@critfc.org;
jean.lee@envintl.com; jeremy_buck@fws.gov;
Smith.Judy@epamail.epa.gov;
Kawabata.Sylvia@epamail.epa.gov; KEPLER Rick J;
tomd@ctsi.nsn.us;
Lori.Cora/R10/USEPA/US@epamail.epa.gov;
Sheldrake.Sean@epamail.epa.gov;
Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; joeo@nezperce.org;
MCCLINCY Matt;
struck.rodney@deg.state.or.us; PETERSON Jenn L; POULSEN
Mike;
Fuentes.Rene@epamail.epa.gov; Black.Curt@epamail.epa.gov;
Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; emadden@ecoisp.com;
Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov;
Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov; jeff.baker@grandronde.org;
Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov;
Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov; TOEPEL
Kathryn; Rose Longoria; 'Ron Gouguet'; 'Chris Thompson';
'Valerie Lee';
'rgensemer@parametrix.com'
Subject: Agenda for Monday's meeting in Centralia

Hello all,

Attached is the agenda for Monday's Portland Harbor Eco-Human Health Subgroup meeting on Risk Assessment scale and other

issues, developed
with the great help of Eco and Human Health team
members. Our meeting is
from 9:30 a.m. until 3:30 p.m. at the Olympic Club in
Centralia,
Washington, and a call-in line will be available (see
agenda).

The primary purpose of our meeting will be to discuss
the LWG's March 15
ERA Decision Framework document to agree on the issues
we'll raise with
the LWG in our April 11 meeting (location TBD) and the
alternatives
we'll provide for what the LWG has proposed. In
preparation for Monday's
meeting, please (1) review the attached agenda (pages 1
through 4) and
(2) carefully and critically read the LWG's Framework
document and come
prepared to discuss major issues and alternatives to
what the LWG has
proposed.

If you have any questions about the meeting, please let
me know.

Thanks,
Mikell
(503) 229-6590

-----Original Message-----

From: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov
[<mailto:Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 5:02 PM
To: audiehuber@ctuir.com; ANDERSON Jim M;
cunninghame@gorge.net;
exec@envintl.com; howp@critfc.org; jean.lee@envintl.com;
jeremy_buck@fws.gov; Smith.Judy@epamail.epa.gov;
Kawabata.Sylvia@epamail.epa.gov; KEPLER Rick J;
tomd@ctsi.nsn.us;
Lori.Cora/R10/USEPA/US@epamail.epa.gov;
Sheldrake.Sean@epamail.epa.gov;
Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; joeo@nezperce.org;
MCCLINCY Matt;
struck.rodney@deg.state.or.us; PETERSON Jenn L; POULSEN
Mike;
Fuentes.Rene@epamail.epa.gov; Black.Curt@epamail.epa.gov;
Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; emadden@ecoisp.com;
Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov;
Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov; jeff.baker@grandronde.org;
Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; OMEALY Mikell;
Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov; TOEPEL Kathryn; Rose
Longoria
Subject: Project Meeting to discuss Scale (as in
risk)/Facilitator for
Framework Discussions

Two quick items before Eric and I check out for Spring
Break

1) We have asked Mikell OMealy to facilitate planning
for the Eco/HH
Subgroup meeting April 3rd (internal meeting on "scale"
) and April 11th
(meeting with LWG to discuss the eco framework), and to
be our
facilitator for the April 3rd and April 11 meetings.
Mikell will be
sending out further details & instructions soon, which
will include
reviewing the LWG's Eco Framework Document . Please
work with Mikell
so we can have a productive discussion on the 3rd and

start our
preparations for meeting with LWG on the April 11th.

2) A few details and initial thoughts on April 3rd -
The SCALE Meeting

Location: Centralia, Washington - Olympic Club (Joe -
this is
reserved, right?)

Time: 9:30am to 3:30pm

Mikell will be developing the agenda with input from the
group. Here
are some thoughts about what we need to accomplish.
Basically, we are
trying to come up with an approach to answer those
nagging questions
about the appropriate scale(s) of the risk assessment.

1) What are the options for looking a scale, (ie,
site-wide, point by
point, intermediate). What basis - home range, AOPC,
physical
constraints, habitat, etc. Is the LWG Eco Framework
document the
appropriate vehicle for moving forward?

2) Eco and HH overlap on scale discussions, framework
discussions.

2) Other examples - Ron Gouguet, NOAA discussion on
approaches used at
other sites.

3) What difference do the different approaches make in
determining site
risk? - Parametrix thoughts on looking at different
assumptions for
exposure estimates; ie preliminary risk calculations
(via Eco and HH
hazard quotients, existing TRVs) for example chemicals
using a couple of
example receptors (including human health from fish
consumption pathway).

4) Preparation for the April 11 meeting with the LWG -
this meeting
will focus on the LWG's framework for eco

If time allows, we will also need to have a short
discussion on the PRE
comments.

--

**Superfund Projects Manager
Fisheries Resource Management Program
Yakama Nation
PO BOX 151
Toppenish, WA 98948
Phone: 509-865-5121 x6365**

This email is confidential, intended only for the named recipient(s) above and may contain information or attachments that are privileged, attorney work products or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender at rose@yakama.com.